## 2006-2008 Mathematics Science Partnership Competitive Grant Scoring Rubric Teacher Leadership Module

Proposals will be scored with a conjunctive model, a scoring procedure that requires the applicant to attain a minimal level of performance on all attributes assessed. All the criteria in Part 1 must be met. If even one is not met then the project is put aside and will not be scored. If a criterion is satisfied, then it will be scored with 1, 2 or 3 with 1 indicating a poor rating and 3 indicating an ideal condition. Reviewers will be required to explain in detail reasons for their scores. If all the criteria in Part I are met, further points can be earned in Part II, for a total of 200 points.

### Part I

If the criteria below are not met, the grant will not be considered for funding.

#### Plan of Work

#### **Description of Plan**

The proposal describes a plan that convincingly demonstrates how the proposed professional development will address the targeted activities\* set forth by the MSP program. The plan described is also reasonable and measurable within the parameters set out by the proposal.

Not met Met (enter rating: 1poor→3 ideal)

#### \*Targeted Activities

**Preparing** and qualifying mathematics and/or science teachers in high needs schools to provide professional development to other mathematics or science teachers at the school and to assist beginning and other teachers at the school in the delivery of the curriculum.

Provide school administrators with information on establishing and supporting learning communities within their buildings.

Establish and maintain a structured communication network for teacher leaders

#### **Research or Evidence Base**

Includes a description of the scientifically-based research (or, at a minimum, theory research) which influenced the proposed response to the identified need(s) and includes the source of the research. The proposal provides sufficiently detailed explanation of how these activities are expected to strengthen the quality of mathematics and science instruction and improve student academic achievement; and how improvement in instruction and achievement will be measured.

Not met Met (enter rating: 1 poor→3 ideal)

#### **Partnership**

A partnership with STEM faculty and eligible schools is clearly evident throughout the proposal. The proposal describes how the partners will share the work and how their work will be integrated into the on-going work of both the local schools and the STEM faculty; and how the impact of this work can be measured.

Not met Met (enter rating: 1 poor→3 ideal)

#### **Management Capability**

Demonstrates that the partnership has the capability of managing the project including organization of the training of teacher leaders statewide and supporting the leaders as they work with high-needs schools. There must also be evidence that the partnership is knowledgeable in the evaluation processes required of a quasi-experimental designed project; including the application of formative and summative evaluation methods.

Not met	Met (enter rating: 1 poor→3 ideal)

All Criteria Met	(Fill in total points and continue to Part II.)
All Criteria Not Met	(Explain)

Total Points from Part I: $x 10 =$ (1)	120 possible)
--	---------------

# 2006-2008 Mathematics Science Partnership Competitive Grant Scoring Rubric Teacher Leadership Module

## Part II

If all the criteria from Part I are met, applicants can earn further points by discussing the following:

Plan of Work
Describes a plan that illustrates convincingly how the proposed professional development is aligned with Michigan's professional development standards (NSDC Staff Development Standards 2001) including a design that provides for work-embedded application of new learning, continuous reflection and ongoing support.
1-3 pts
Includes a detailed timeline that shows when specific activities will occur and the partner responsible for each activity.
1-3 pts
Budget Summary and Detail
The proposed budget is realistic for the described plan and enables the partnership to obtain the expected outcomes. It also takes into account the need to provide data to the state project evaluator.
1-3 pts
Appendix
The appendix contains resumes of key faculty and staff and letters of interest from STEM faculty.
1-3 pts
Partnerships
There is evidence that the Michigan Mathematics and Science Network Centers are core partners in the proposal.
1-4 pts
Total Points from Part II: x 5 = (80 possible)
Total Part II points (80)
Total Part I points (120)
Total (200)